



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,955	02/01/2001	Anthony Pearson	1	9133
7590	05/14/2004		EXAMINER	
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP 90 Forest Avenue Locust Valley, NY 11560			MOSLEHI, FARHOOD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	3
DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/773,955	PEARSON, ANTHONY
	Examiner Farhood Moslehi	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2001.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmidt et al. (6,363,258) (hereinafter Schmidt).

4. As per claim 1, Schmidt teaches a portable communication device for facilitating group communications relating to predefined discussion topics between a user and one or more participants, the portable communication device comprising:

A full-duplex transceiver, the transceiver sending and receiving signals on one of a plurality of channels, each of the channels corresponding to a predefined discussion topic (e.g. col. 1, lines 46-50); and a channel selector operatively coupled to the transceiver for selecting a particular one of the transceiver channels and a corresponding discussion topic (e.g. col. 1, lines 55-60).

5. As per claim 10, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
6. As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
7. As per claim 2, Schmidt teaches the portable communication device, wherein the transceiver further comprises at least one user-definable channel being assigned to a particular discussion topic by the user (e.g. col. 1, lines 45-50).
8. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
9. As per claim 3, Schmidt teaches the portable communication device further comprising a processor operative to at least partially control one or more functions of the portable communication device (e.g. col. 3, lines 54-60).
10. As per claim 12, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
11. As per claim 4, Schmidt teaches the portable communication device, further comprising a display operatively coupled to the processor, the display visually indicating at least one of (i) a selected channel (e.g. col. 3, lines 54-63, it is an inherent property of the display 28 to show various aspects and information related to each call); (ii) a corresponding discussion topic assigned to the selected channel (e.g. col. 3, lines 54-63 it is an inherent property of the display 28 to show various aspects and information related to each call); and (iii) a number of users participating in the selected discussion topic (e.g. col. 3, lines 54-63 it is an inherent property of the display 28 to show various aspects and information related to each call).
12. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
13. As per claim 5, Schmidt teaches the portable communications device, further comprising voice recognition circuitry operatively coupled to the transceiver, the voice

recognition circuitry being responsive to one or more audio input signals and at least partially controlling the transceiver for transmitting the audio input signals to the one or more participants (e.g. col. 4, lines 60-65).

14. As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
15. As per claim 19, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
16. As per claim 7, Schmidt teaches the portable communication device further comprising:

Menu circuitry operatively coupled to at least one of the transceiver and the channel selector, the menu circuitry providing an interface for indicating to a present setting of one or more predetermined functions of the portable communication device and for modifying the one or more predetermined functions (e.g. col. 5, lines 35-43); and an indicator operatively coupled to the menu circuitry for indicating the one or more predetermined functions of the portable communication device (e.g. col. 3, lines 55-62).

17. As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
18. As per claim 8, Schmidt teaches the portable communication device wherein the transceiver further comprises:

An input for being operatively coupled to a microphone transducer (e.g. col. 4, lines 28-45); an output for being operatively coupled to an earpiece transducer (e.g. col. 4, lines 28-45); and an antenna connection for being operatively coupled to an antenna (e.g. col. 4, lines 28-45).

19. As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

20. As per claim 9, Schmidt teaches the portable communication device, further comprising an on-line indicator, the on-line indicator being responsive to at least one of (i) a participant entering a selected channel and (ii) a participant leaving the selected channel, the on-line indicator providing an indication in response thereto (e.g. col. 2, lines 50-60).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of Park (6,260,012).

23. As per claim 6, Schmidt does not specifically teach the portable communication device wherein the voice recognition circuitry is further operative to at least partially control the channel selector in response to the one or more audio input signals. Park teaches the portable communication device wherein the voice recognition circuitry is further operative to at least partially control the channel selector in response to the one or more audio input signals (e.g. col. 4, lines 23-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Schmidt with Park. The motivation would have been for speech recognition capabilities in the communications device.

24. As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fm



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100